REMARKS

Claims 1-17 were examined, and all claims were rejected. With this response, claims 2-10, 13-14 and 16-17 are amended, claims 1, 11, 12 and 15 are canceled, and new claims 18-22 are added. All amendments and new claims are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. New claims 18-22 contain limitations similar to those recited in canceled claims 1, 11, 12 and 15, and are also supported by at least page 19, lines 12-26 of the specification. The amendments to claims 2-10, 13-14 and 16-17 are to place the claims in better form, and so that the claims now depend from the newly added claims. Supporting structure for the functions recited in claim 22 can be found at least at page 37, lines 13-21

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in light of the following remarks.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant acknowledges that the information disclosure statement submitted November 21, 2003 has been considered by the Office.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 11, 12 and 15 are canceled, and new claims 18-21 reflect the limitations recited in these canceled claims. Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 18-21 are in proper format so that a clear understanding of the claims is presented. Therefore, the objections to claims 1, 11, 12 and 15 is overcome by the cancellation of these claims and the additional of new claims 18-21. In addition, applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 and 3 as amended are in proper format and present a clear understanding of the claim.

Claims 12 and 15 are canceled and new claims 20 and 21 correspond to these claims. The objection with respect to the "and/or" limitation recited in claims 12 and 15 is overcome, since 20 and 21 only recite "and." Claim 16 is amended to recite "and" instead of "and/or," therefore applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to claim 16.

Claim Rejections Under § 103 and New Claims 18-22

At section 7, on page 3 of the Office Action claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Andrews et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,105,062) in view of Jonsson et al.

("SyncML—Getting the Mobile Internet in Sync," Ericsson Review No. 3, 2001). Claim 18 recites limitations contained in cancelled claim 1, and therefore this rejection will be discussed in relation to claim 18.

Claim 18 recites a method of providing an object structure comprising several objects in order to produce a node structure, which for example could be a device management tree or application related information. Andrews discusses the application of containment rules to a hierarchical data structure, and in contrast claim 18 addresses defining containment rules for a hierarchical data structure on the basis of an object structure.

Claim 18 recites that a plurality of objects comprises different types of objects out of a group including at least a fixed object, a run-time object, a leaf object, and a link object. Andrews does not disclose or suggest either a fixed object or a run-time object. With respect to the run-time object, it is asserted that running programs executing in a run-time environment disclose a run-time object. However, Andrews only discloses than an embodiment of the invention may be program instructions that execute in a run-time environment. See Andrews column 5, lines 58-61. Andrews is only discussing the operation of the methodology according to the invention discussed in Andrews, and makes no mention of a run-time object. To further clarify this distinction, claim 18 includes additional information regarding the run-time object type, namely that a title of a run-time object is defined during run-time. Therefore, Andrews does not disclose or suggest a run-time object as recited in claim 18.

Furthermore, claim 18 includes additional information regarding a fixed object type over what was recited in canceled claim 1. In particular, claim 18 recites that the fixed object type has a fixed title. Andrews does not disclose or suggest an object type that has a fixed title. For example, Andrews discloses that root objects are to be renamed if there is a naming conflict. See Andrews column 9, lines 26-27. In contrast, the fixed object type recited in claim 18 has a fixed title, and therefore is not renamed. The Office asserts that the moving of large numbers of objects is equivalent to fixed objects. See Andrews column 6, lines 38-40. However, as discussed above, fixed objects as recited in claim 18 have a fixed title. If objects are moved in Andrews there is the potential for a naming conflict, which will result in the objects having to be renamed to resolve the conflict. Therefore, while objects remain in their respective sub-tree during the move, they are not "fixed type" as recited in claim 18 because there is still the potential that their name will be changed to resolve a naming conflict. See column 9, lines 48-

49. Therefore, for at least these reasons claim 18 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, either alone or in combination, and is novel and nonobvious in view of the cited references.

New claims 19-22 contain limitations similar to those recited in new claim 18, and for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 18, are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. As such, new claims 19-22 are novel and nonobvious in view of the cited references.

Dependent claims 2-10, 13-14 and 16-17 are amended to depend from a new independent claim, and therefore are patentable at least in view of their dependencies.

In addition, with respect to claim 2 a renaming as discussed by Andrews in order to eliminate conflicts in a directory tree is not the equivalent to a rejection of an object definition, which results in an omission of the object definition, i.e. the object is not defined and not included. Furthermore, with respect to claim 3, Andrews fails to disclose or suggest a substitution of two objects by a new object. Andrews describes the maintaining of all objects, and if necessary the modifying of the object such that the directory structure complies with the containment rules. In contrast, claim 3 recites replacing a parent object and a new object with a combined new object. Therefore, for at least these additional reasons, claims 2 and 3 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Conclusion

The objections and rejections of the Office Action having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested, and passage to issue of the present application is earnestly solicited. The undersigned believes that no additional fee is required to submit this response, but hereby authorizes the Commission to charge deposit account 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 22 August 2006

Keith R. Obert
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

KRO/kas
Ware, Fressola, Van Der Sluys & Adolphson LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
(203) 261-1234
FAX: (203) 261-5676
Customer No. 004955